

A *Ms. 25*
R E V I E W
O F T H E
Lutheran Principles;

S H E W I N G,

How they differ from the Church of *England*,
and that *Baron Puffendorf's* ESSAY for
Uniting of *Protestants*, was not design'd
to procure an UNION between the *Lu-*
therans and the Church of *England*, as is
insinuated in the Title of the late Edition
of that Book.

I N A

L E T T E R to a Friend.

By *THOMAS BRETT*, LL. D.
Rector of *Betteshanger* in *Kent*.

Bishop. *Will you be ready with all faithful Diligence
to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange
Doctrines, contrary to God's Word?*

Answer. *I will, the Lord being my Helper.* Form of
[Ordering Priests.]

London: Printed for HENRY CLEMENTS,
at the Half-Moon in St. Paul's Church-
yard. 1714.

THE EYE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE

OF THE



A
R E V I E W
O F T H E

Lutheran Principles, &c.

S I R,



OME Time ago you ask'd me if I had seen a Book advertis'd in the *Evening Post* of *August* 14. 1714. call'd *A View of the Principles of the Lutheran Churches*, shewing how far they agree with the Church of England. Being a seasonable Essay for the uniting of Protestants upon the happy Accession of his Majesty King George to the Throne of these Kingdoms. Translated from the Latin of Baron Puffendorf, &c. And whether I knew the Design of it? I then told you, that I saw the Book long ago translated into English by the same Person, who is said to have translated this: That it is call'd *The Divine Feudal*

Feudal Law, or Covenants with Mankind, represented. Together with Means for the uniting of Protestants. In which also the Principles of the Lutheran Churches are stated and defended, by Samuel Baron Puffendorf; translated from the Latin, &c. And that it was only a new Title put to an old Book.

You said, that however that was, you could not but be pleas'd with the Book, if it answer'd the Title; and thought this new Publication of it very seasonable: Because, upon the Accession of his Majesty to this Crown, it was very probable, that many *Lutherans* would come over with him: That his Majesty's Subjects in the Duchy of *Branswick* were all *Lutherans*, and therefore, as we were now united under one King, it was very expedient, that we should also be united in one Religion. I said, that Union in Religion was very desirable, and ought to be endeavour'd by all lawful Means, but that I had not yet seen any Proposals that way, that seem'd likely to effect it. That forasmuch as we had not been able hitherto to procure an Union in Religion between *England* and *Scotland*, though they have been united under one King for above an hundred Years, and both lie in the same Island, and speak the same Language, I could not conceive how

we

Lutheran Principles.

5

we should unite with those, who, though under the same King, are separated from us, not only by a very different Language, but also by the Sea, and a vast Tract of Land besides. You reply'd, that you did not conceive there was so great a Difference between us and the *Lutherans* in Matters of Religion, as between us and the *Scots*, and therefore, notwithstanding the Distance of Place and Language, you conceiv'd we might much more easily unite with the *Lutherans*, than with the *Scots*, or any other of the *Reform'd*, who were nearer to us: Because, the *Scots* and all those call'd the *Reform'd*, were profess'd *Presbyterians*, and declar'd Enemies to Episcopacy and Liturgy; and would allow no Ceremonies in Religious Worship: But the *Lutherans* were more ceremonious in their Worship, than the Church of *England*; that they not only retain'd the Surplice, the Cross at Baptism, God-Fathers and God-Mothers, and Kneeling at the Holy Communion (which were the main Points that the *Scots* and our *English Presbyterians*, and the others call'd *Reform'd*, have quarrel'd with from King *Edward's* Days (when our *Common-Prayer* was establish'd) to this Time, that is, almost two hundred Years; but they have also Images and Pictures of our Sa-
viour,

viour, the *Virgin Mary*, the *Apostles*, and other *Saints*, set up in their Churches; nay, they have *Relicks* also, which are devoutly shew'd and kiss'd. They have also a *Liturgy* or *Book of Common-Prayer*, not much differing from ours, and not only *Organs*, but all sorts of the finest *Musick*

* See Pitt's Atlas, Vol. II. p. 21. in their Churches: * And that they are such Enemies to the *Calvinists*, or those who call themselves the *Reform'd*, that they hate such, as bad as a *Turk*; and that in the great Church at *Leipsick* in *Saxony*, *Luther's* own Country, they have the *Pictures* of the *Devil*, *Ignatius Loyola* the Founder of the *Jesuites*, and of *John Calvin*, all in one Frame, with this Subscription, *The three great Enemies of Christ, and of the Christian Religion*. Nay, more than this, they, to this very Day, retain *Auricular Confession*, and go to the Priest every *Saturday Evening* to be confess'd and absolv'd. And though they have not *Bishops*, yet they have *Superintendents* to oversee and govern the other Clergy, which you conceiv'd differ'd from *Bishops* only in Name. Therefore, upon the whole, you concluded, that an Union with the *Lutherans* would be more easy to be effected, than could be with the *Scots* or other *Presbyterians*. That indeed you thought there was little or no Difference

Lutheran Principles.

7

rence betwixt them and the *High-Churchmen*, and that if any Obstruction should be given to such an Union, you thought it must proceed from the *Low-Churchmen*, who were rather for taking away some of the Ceremonies we have already, than for adding any more to them, which you judged would be necessary in order to unite with the *Lutherans*. I reply'd, that Ceremonies were but indifferent Things, and that I conceiv'd, if the Differences between us and the *Lutherans*, or between us and any other Protestants, had lain only in Ceremonies, there might have been an Union amongst us long before this Time. You answer'd, that you did not believe there was any essential Difference between us and the *Lutherans*: And though there was, you thought it very necessary we should seek to unite with them at this Time, because both his Majesty and the Prince had been educated in that Religion. I reply'd, that whatever his Majesty's Religion was whilst he was only Elector of *Brunswick*, now he was King of *Great-Britain*, &c. he was oblig'd by Act of Parliament to join in Communion with the Church of *England*: And, therefore, since it was not thought reasonable to make any Alterations in the Doctrine or Discipline of the Establish'd

Church for the Sake of his Majesty and his Royal Family, I could see no Occasion there was for the making Alterations for the Sake of any of his Subjects. You said, that however, if the Thing was easy and practicable, you thought it ought to be done: And though you was perfectly satisfy'd with the whole Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship of the Church of *England*, as now settled; yet, if some few Alterations in indifferent Things might bring so great a Number of his Majesty's Subjects, as the *Lutherans* were, into our Communion, you should very heartily desire to see those Alterations made. I told you, that I was convinc'd by Baron *Puffendorf's* Book, which had given Occasion to this Discourse between us, that such an Union was altogether impracticable. You seem'd to wonder, that this Learned Baron should propose an impracticable Scheme. I answer'd, that you had been deceiv'd by the Title of the Book; that he did not write this Essay with any Design to promote an Union between the *Lutherans* and the Church of *England*, but between the *Lutherans* and the *Calvinists*. That indeed

* Pag. 197 he does name * *England* in his Book, but
and 137. he names us as a Party of the *Calvinists*,
differing only from the other *Reform'd*,
in

Lutheran Principles.

9

in our retaining Bishops amongst us. Which only shews, that he was a perfect Stranger to the Constitution of our Church. Hereupon, you desir'd me to give you a particular Account of his Book, and what Grounds I have to think from what he says, that an Union between us and the *Lutherans* is wholly impracticable. And I promis'd to do it as soon as I had Opportunity. In order, therefore, to satisfy your Request, and to perform my Promise on this Occasion, I give you the Trouble of this Letter.

I shall not trouble you, or myself, with a nice Examination of all the Particulars in the learned Baron's Book, and therefore shall pass over all that he says by way of Introduction, concerning the Condition of humane Nature, and the Inconveniencies which attend our natural Frailty, and that Religion has been abus'd to increase the Miseries of Mankind; as also what he says about Toleration. I shall begin with what he says concerning * *the* * *Reconcilement of Differences in Religion.* *P. 18.* This, he well observes, *can by no means be so done, as to have it declared that both are Truth, forasmuch as it is necessary from the Nature of Things, that in a Contradiction between two Propositions, one or other of them must needs be false.* But to
effect

effect a Reconcilement in this Case, one Opinion must of Necessity be declared and approved for Truth, and the other be rejected as False. Nor farther, is a Reconciliation to be made, by bringing all Parties to account, that all Religions are alike useful, and effectual towards the Salvation of Men; or by a Declaration, that this may be attained in any Religion that bears the Name of Christian. For this were to make the Christian Religion irrational, and a Discipline not rightly cohering with itself, but a Mass of Principles disagreeing with, and mutually destroying each other. Nor is it a fit Method of composing Differences, to declare, that the Opinions about which the Parties differ, are only problematical, and such, as that it concerns not any Man's Salvation to which Part of the Contradiction he gives his Assent: Because we must not think it an arbitrary Thing, or what depends on the Will of Man, that a Question be declar'd problematical and indifferent. It is therefore necessary, that after the controverted Opinions are searched to the Foundation, and the Truth of the one, and the Falshood of the other, are plainly demonstrated from the genuine Books of Holy Scripture; they who have heretofore held a false Opinion do renounce this, and yield to, and embrace the Truth. In
all

Lutheran Principles.

II

all this I am perfectly of this learned Baron's Opinion, and conceive it very agreeable to the Eighteenth Article of our Church, which says, *They are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every Man shall be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth, so that he be diligent to frame his Life according to that Law.* But then, as he farther observes, a perfect Reconciliation of this Sort, such as that they who have hitherto cherish'd and maintain'd erroneous Opinions, should abandon these, and agree with others in the Truth, considering the present State and Manners of Mankind, is a Thing rather to be desir'd, than it can be hoped to be accomplish'd.

Now, if this be the only Way to a Reconcilement, as indeed I think it is, how is it possible to procure a Reconcilement any other Way, than by drawing Men off from their Errors? Thus for Instance, I see no other Way that the Church of *England* has to obtain a Reconciliation, and an Union with other Protestants, than to convince them by plain Arguments (drawn from the Scriptures, and the universal Practice of the pure Primitive Church) that they are in an Error in all those Points, wherein they differ from her. And I can see no other Way of procuring an Union amongst Protestants, than by
persuading

persuading all of them, whether *Lutherans* or *Calvinists*, to reconcile themselves to the Church of *England*.

However, the Learned *Puffendorf* has proposed another Method, which is, That on both Sides there should be an Agreement in a solid, sufficient, and adequate Foundation of Faith. And that with relation to other Opinions, which do not come within the Compass of the Foundation of the Faith, a Toleration should be granted, and none should form a distinct separate Communion for the Sake of them. But how is this Agreement to be made? It must be, I suppose, by a Synod or Council composed of select Deputies of both Parties. It is hardly probable, such a Council, composed of two Parties, as suppose the one Half *Calvinists*, and the other *Lutherans*, should agree, what shall be Fundamental Articles, and what not. They might squabble and dispute, but it is not likely they would be more able to convince one another by such Disputation, than they have been by Writing. An equal Number of both Sides must appear in the Council, and if the *Calvinists* can draw one or two *Lutherans* to their Side, then the Point shall be determined in Favour of *Calvin*, and his Doctrine shall be Fundamental, and so *vice versa*. But will this satisfy the other Side, and

and bring them into an Agreement? Will not they go off from them, and continue their Separation as before? Therefore, though it be easily said, that *on both Sides there should be an Agreement in a solid, sufficient, and adequate Foundation of Faith*, and if this was once accomplish'd, other Matters might more easily be rectified; yet, How shall we come at this Agreement? *Hic Labor, Hoc Opus*. And therefore, I do not see we are any thing nearer to this Agreement, than we were before Baron Puffendorf published his Book; nor does he propose any Means by which we are to come to it. However, the Baron himself does not suppose it possible to reconcile all Parties of *Christians*; * he only supposes it * P. 32. possible, that a *System of Divinity may be composed, in which the two Parties of Protestants, which have commonly gone under the Name of the LUTHERANS, and the Reform'd, may consent and agree*. And amongst the *Reform'd*, which are otherwise also call'd *Zuinglians* or *Calvinists*, he reckons the *English*, as I have already observ'd. But herein he has only shew'd himself to have been unacquainted with our Church. • For our Reformation was not made on the Principles either of *Zuinglius* or *Calvin*, but founded on the Scriptures,

Scriptures, and the Doctrine and Practice of the truly Primitive Church. Therefore, though he names *England* amongst the *Reform'd*, yet forasmuch as he appears so egregiously mistaken in the Constitution of our Church, and his Scheme is only to procure a Reconcilement between the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*, it is evident, that his Book contains nothing tending to reconcile the *Lutherans* and the Church of *England*, whatever is pretended in the new Title Page. I will therefore now shew, that according to him, there can be no Reconcilement between us and the *Lutherans*, unless we can persuade them to come entirely over to us, or we shall think it proper to go entirely over to them.

- * P. 29. He lays down this as a Rule, * That where there are some valuable Advantages of this World, annexed to the controverted Points of Religion, it is not to be imagined that they can be ended by Disputes or Reasonings: And from thence concludes, that it is in vain to attempt a Reconcilement between *Protestants* and *Papists*, because there are worldly Advantages annexed to the Points which are controverted between them. And he says, † If any of the *Papal Party* should propose, in order to a Reconcilement, that there should be nothing
- said

† P. 43.

said about Restoring the Revenues of the Church to those who return to the Roman Religion, we ought to beware of them, and to believe that Nothing but meer Shows and Snares are intended in such Proposals.

Now, if this be a good Argument, (and I see no Reason to say it is not) then this very Thing must also render a Reconcilement between any of the Foreign Protestants and the Church of *England* impracticable. Because, if we propose to them the Restoration of Episcopacy, tho' we should tell them that Lordships and large Revenues are not necessary to the Episcopal Office, and their Princes and other great Men who have shar'd the Bishops Lands amongst them shall not be obliged to make Restitution, they will suspect that this is only a Show and a Snare, and that the Bishops Lands must be again annex'd to the Office, if Episcopacy be restor'd. And if we should join in Communion with them, without the Restoration of Episcopacy amongst them, this, by the very same Argument, may prove a Snare to take our Bishops Lands, and to overthrow the Hierarchy amongst us. This great controverted Point therefore betwixt them and us having such valued Advantages of this World annexed to it, according to *Baron Puffendorf's* Arguing, does plainly
render

render the Differences between us and other Protestants irreconcilable, and that it is in vain to attempt such an Union.

* P. 44.

* In the next place he proceeds to examine a certain Form in Manuscript, of a *Method to restore an Ecclesiastical Union between the Romanists and the Protestants, written by the special Command of the Most Serene Prince and Lord N. N. by two of his Highness's Divines*, to which he returns an Answer Paragraph by Paragraph. There is but one Point in this Examen, which, I think, needs my present Notice.

† P. 57.

† These two Divines make this Proposal: *Let the Ordination made by Presbyters of Pastors and Teachers in the Protestant Churches by Prayer, and the Imposition of Hands, be held Legitimate, and conformed to the Apostolick Practice; and those who are in this Manner ordain'd to the Sacred Office, be accounted to have Power both of Order and Jurisdiction.* To this the Baron says, *This Principle is of the greatest Importance. For, as the State of the Protestant Churches depends, as external, upon the Ordination, and it is by this that they must deserve to be accounted legitimate Bodies; so the Proposal obliquely overthrowes the whole Pontifical State, as it is altogether repugnant to that, to allow any for lawful Pastors, that do not depend upon that.* Here it

it may be observ'd by the way, that it's evident from this Passage, that the *Lutherans* have no *Bishops*, that their *Superintendants*, if it could be granted that they have any Orders at all, are only meer *Presbyters*, who have, it may be, a Jurisdiction like that of our *Archdeacons*, who nevertheless are no more *Bishops* than *Parish-Priests* are; and notwithstanding their Superintendency, they do not pretend to be any Thing more than *Presbyters*, and, as such, claim the Power both of Order and Jurisdiction; and consequently are as meer *Presbyterians*, as the *Calvinists* themselves. Now this Principle, as the Learned *Puffendorf* says, is of the highest Importance, not only in the Controversy between them and the Church of *Rome*, but in the Controversy between them and us. For as he also observes, *The State of their Churches depends upon their Ordination, and if they have not true Orders amongst them, then can they not be accounted legitimate Bodies*, that is, they cannot be esteem'd Christian Churches or Societies. And if we do allow their Ordinations, then we obliquely overthrow the whole Episcopal State, as it is altogether repugnant to an Episcopal Church to allow any for lawful Pastors, who are not Episcopally ordain'd. And it is certain, our Church does not allow Presbyterian Ordination: For, in the Preface before the Form of Making and Consecrating Bishops, &c. it

is declar'd, that it is evident to all Men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles Time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which Offices were evermore had in such reverend Estimation, that no Man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first call'd, try'd, examin'd, and known to have such Qualities as are requisite for the same; and also by Publick Prayer with Imposition of Hands, were approv'd and admitted thereunto by lawful Authority. And therefore, to the intent that these Orders may be continu'd, and reverently esteem'd in the Church of England, no Man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffer'd to exercise any of the said Functions, except he be call'd, try'd, examin'd, and admitted thereunto according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination. In this Place our Church not only plainly declares Episcopal Ordination to be necessary for a legitimate Priest or Presbyter, as well as for a Bishop, but that it has always been so even from the Apostles Days, consequently that it is not in her Power to alter it, being founded on the Scriptures, and the Practice of the Catholick Church. But those two *Lutheran Divines*, and Baron *Puffendorf* do insist, that *Presbyterian Ordination*

nation must be allow'd, not only in Cases of extreme Necessity, which is the Plea some of our moderate Divines have made for them, but *must be held legitimate and conform'd to Apostolick Practice.* We and they are therefore certainly irreconcilable in this Point, which, as the Learned Baron says, *is a Principle of the greatest Importance.* For they will not yield this Point to us, because, as he observes, if they do so, *they cannot be accounted legitimate Bodies or Churches.* And we cannot yield to them, but we must give the Lye to the declar'd Testimony of our Church. For if we close with them, we must say, that *Ordination by Presbyters is conform'd to Apostolick Practice:* Whereas our Church has already declar'd *Episcopal Ordination alone, to be conformable to that Practice,* and declar'd this *to be evident to all Men diligently reading Holy Scriptures and ancient Authors.* Now this being a Point of the *greatest Importance,* as Baron Puffendorf acknowledges, cannot be left Problematical or Indifferent: It must be declar'd, that the Truth lies on one Side or other, if a Reconcilement should be attempted; for both Sides cannot be right. If Presbyterian Ordination be conformable to Apostolical Practice, it is certain such Episcopal Ordination, as excludes Presbyters from the Right of Ordaining, and Nullifies the pretended Orders given by them, cannot be agreeable

agreeable to that Practice ; and if such Episcopal Ordination be agreeable to Apostolical Practice, then Presbyterian Ordination cannot be conform to that Practice. One of these Opinions must therefore be agreed by both Parties to be true, and the other must be rejected, or there can be no Reconciliation : But these two Learned *Lutheran* Divines, (and Baron *Puffendorf* joins with them herein) say, that they cannot yield, that their Ordinations are not agreeable to Apostolick Practice, because, if they should, they would unchurch themselves : And I am sure, if we yield to them in this Matter, we must deny the clearest Evidence of Scripture and Antiquity. This single Point therefore makes an Union between us, and either the *Lutherans* or *Calvinists* altogether impracticable, and renders it in vain to attempt it by any other Means, than by convincing them (if possible) of their Errors, and persuading them to come entirely into our Communion.

After the Learned Baron has thus shew'd, that it is in vain to attempt an Union between the *Lutherans* and those who will not allow their Ordinations to be Valid, which I have prov'd the Church of *England* cannot do ; he then * proceeds to shew, that it is next to Madness to go about to attempt a Reconciliation with the Socinians, Anabaptists, Quakers, and those that deserve the
Name

* P. 76.

Name of Phanaticks, so long as they will hold to their Hypotheses. And having thus cast off all that bear the Name of Christians, except the *Calvinists*, as Men with whom it is impossible for the *Lutherans* to think of having any Union, [and I have shew'd, that the Church of *England* must come into the Number of those with whom they can have no Hopes of Reconcilement,] * he then proceeds to enquire, whether there may not be a Possibility of effecting an Union, between the *Lutherans* and those who call themselves the *Reform'd*. Here having compos'd a System of Divinity, wherein he supposes both Parties may agree, he then proceeds to the Points wherein they differ. I shall not at present particularly examine his System, only take Notice, that when he comes to the Points wherein the *Lutherans* differ from the *Calvinists*, he maintains two Things which the Christian Church never heard of till *Luther's* Days, and which none but the *Lutherans* ever asserted, and therefore I cannot but make some Observations on them. * P. 82.

The † Learned Baron complains, that al- † P. 199.
tho' the Reformed frequently use the Name of Brethren, yet they omit not to impute to the *Lutherans*, monstrous Opinions, how much soever they contradict them. And, indeed, I do find that *Peter Martyr*, one of the first Reformers, and one of the most moderate

amongst them, who was therefore invited into *England*, and made Divinity-Professor at *Oxford*, does call one of the *Lutheran* Opinions monstrous, which is, that which concerns the *Ubiquity of the Body of Christ*,

* *Dial. de utraque in Christo Natura*, Fol. 1. for he calls it * *portentosam Ubiquitatem*. But do the *Lutherans* contradict this? No, the Learned Baron himself endeavours to maintain and defend it, nay, declares that † *P. 195.* he designs to die in that Opinion. † For

he tells us, that he would not have the Things which he shall propose, to create any Prejudice against himself or the Church, in which he was born, and has been educated, and in the Doctrine of which he has design'd to persevere to the End of his Life.

|| *P. 202.* And one of these Doctrines he owns to be the Omnipresence of the Body of Christ. And he tells us, that the Lutherans seem to maintain it chiefly for this Reason, that they may not divide and take away the Union of the two Natures, which, according to the Expression of the ancient Church concerning it, is inseparable. But did any of the ancient Church believe Christ's Body to be Omnipresent, because they believ'd the two Natures to be inseparable? The

† *Joh. i. 1, 14, 17.* Scripture teacheth us, that † in the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. And that the Word was made Flesh, and dwelt among us, and was call'd Jesus Christ.

From

From whence we rightly conclude, that *Jesus Christ* was both God and Man, by a Personal Union of two Natures, one of the Word or God the Son, and the other of the Flesh or Humane Nature. The Scriptures also teach, that * *Jesus Christ*, the * *Hebr.* Person subsisting of these two Natures, is *xiii. 8.* *the same Yesterday, and to Day, and for ever:* Hence we justly gather, that these two Natures in this one Person are inseparable; for, if the Natures should be separated, he could not remain the same Person for ever. This Inseparability therefore of the two Natures the ancient Church believ'd upon good and just Grounds; and both the *Reform'd* and the Church of *England* believe this no less than the *Lutherans*; and we declare our Belief of this Inseparability in the *Athanasian Creed*, where we acknowledge *God and Man to be one Christ*: But then we declare, that he is *one altogether*; not by *Confusion of Substance*, but by *Unity of Person*. And we conceive, that the Omnipresence of Christ's Humane Body must make a Confusion of Substance; for the Body of Christ cannot be Omnipresent, unless it be converted into the Godhead, because Omnipresence is an incommunicable Attribute of the Divine Nature; and if the Humane Nature of Christ be converted into the Godhead, this must make a Confusion of Substance. So that this Doctrine directly tends

to overthrow an Article of our Faith. Neither does it help at all to make us more firmly believe the inseparable Union of the two Natures in *Christ*, which is the Reason assign'd by *Puffendorf*, for which the *Lutherans* chiefly maintain it; for those who believe not this Ubiquity of *Christ's* Body, do nevertheless believe the inseparable Union of his two Natures, and believe it upon the infallible Authority of the Holy Scriptures: But I can see no Authority of Holy Scripture for the Doctrine of the Omnipresence of *Christ's* Body.

The Learned Baron, indeed, does give us two Texts of Scripture, but I conceive very little to the Purpose. *Christ*, he observes, has promised *where two or three are gathered together in my Name, I will be in the midst of them*, Matth. xviii. 20. *And I am with you to the end of the World*, Matth. xxviii. 20. But does it hence follow, that *Christ* will be always with us in his Body? If his Divine Nature alone be present with us, that, according to the Scriptures, is a sufficient Fulfilling of his Promise: For the Divine and Humane Nature make but One Person in *Christ*, who, although He be God and Man, yet He is not Two, but One *Christ*. One, not by Conversion of the Godhead into Flesh, but by taking of the Manhood into God. One altogether, not by Confusion of Substance, but by Unity of Person. For as the reasonable
Soul

Soul and Flesh is one Man, so God and Man is one Christ: As we profess in the *Athanasian Creed*. Hence it follows, that as whatsoever is predicated either of the Soul or Body of a Man, is attributed to the whole Person, though some Functions are peculiar to the Soul, and others to the Body; so, whatsoever is predicated of one Nature in *Christ*, though some Functions are peculiar to the Humane, and others to the Divine Nature, are attributed to the whole Person of *Christ*. Thus for Instance, it is the peculiar Function of the Soul of Man, to think, to reason, and to meditate; and we cannot attribute these Faculties to the Body of a Man: For, to say that the Soul of a Man eats, drinks, walks, is seen, or felt, is improper; and yet, when we speak of the whole Man, we may properly say, such a Person thinks, reasons, and meditates; or that such a Person eats, drinks, walks, or may be seen or felt. Thus what is peculiar either to the Soul or Body, is attributed to the whole Man, by reason of the Personal Union of those two different Natures, the Soul and the Body, and yet each have their distinct Properties, and what is peculiar to one Nature, cannot properly and strictly be predicated of the other. And in this manner we profess to believe the Union of the Divine and Humane Nature in *Christ*. It is a Personal Union, so that

that whatever is predicated of one Nature, is attributed to the whole *Christ*. Thus it is the Divine Nature of *Christ*, which was in the Beginning with God, and which was God; all Things were made by him, and without him was not any Thing made which was made: These Things cannot be attributed to his Humane Nature, which was not in the Beginning. So the Humane Nature of *Christ* was born of a Woman, made under the Law, was crucified, died, and was buried, none of which Things can properly be attributed to his Godhead. Yet by vertue of the Personal Union between the Divine and Humane Nature, we say that *Christ* is over all, God blessed for ever; likewise that *Christ* was born, suffered, died and was buried; and what is peculiar to one Nature, is attributed by the Scripture to the whole Person. And by saying the Divine Nature of *Christ* did not die, but only his Humane Nature, we do not thereby separate the Personal Union of the two Natures; they still continued one Person; and we say that *Christ*, who is both God and Man, died; and the Scripture itself scruples

* *Act. xx.* not to call the Blood which he shed, * *the*
 28. *Blood of God*. Since then the inseparable Union of the Divine and Humane Nature in *Christ* is a Personal Union, and whatever is predicated of one Nature, is attributed to the whole Person, though each Nature

Nature have its own peculiar distinct Properties, there is no Occasion for us to confound the two Natures, by attributing Omnipresence to the Humane, which is the peculiar Property of the Divine Nature, for fear of separating the two Natures. For a Personal Union, as we understand by the Union of our Souls and Bodies, is such an Union of two Natures, that though each retain its peculiar Properties entire and without Confusion, yet whatever is performed by either, is attributed to the whole Person. Therefore, though we believe the Divine Nature alone to be now present with us, the Humane Nature being ascended into Heaven, and sitting at the Right Hand of God, yet *Christ* is, nevertheless, present with us, because such, [as I have shewed] is the Property of Personal Union, that whatever is predicated of one Nature, is properly attributed to the whole Person.

But here the Learned Baron asks, *Why should the Nature and Quality of Humane Bodies hinder, but that we may believe whole Christ, and even as Man, to be present to all the Assemblies of the Faithful, and even to every particular Person of them? especially, since whilst he was conversant on Earth, both before and after his Resurrection, he performed such Actions, as other Bodies are incapable of.* To this we may answer, that if *Christ* had ever promised us his Bodily

dily Presence in our Assemblies, there had been Reason to have believed he would have been so present with us; but we can find no such Promise: But he has told us the direct contrary, saying, * *I go my way to him that sent me, and now I am no more in the World.* And while they beheld, he was taken up, and a Cloud received him out of their Sight. There are many other Passages in Scripture, which teach us that *Christ* has withdrawn his Bodily Presence from us, but not one which so much as intimates, that he will afford us his Real Bodily Presence, either in a visible or invisible manner. The utmost which the *Lutherans* pretend to prove in this Case, is, that it is possible for God to make *Christ's* Body Omnipresent. But because it is possible, must we therefore believe it is so? Must an Article of Faith be founded on a meer Possibility, without any Foundation in Scripture? But *Christ* has promised to be always present with us. He has so, but not Bodily present: And the Scripture teacheth, that his Body is ascended into Heaven, and sitteth on the Right Hand of God. And I have shewed, that if his Divinity be with us, *Christ* is with us by vertue of the Personal Union, because whatsoever is performed by one Nature, is performed by the Person. *Christ* has also Himself taught us, that till his second Coming, he will be with

with us by his Spirit. * *I go away*, says * *Joh. xvi.*
 he, *to him that sent me, and if I go not a-* *5, 7. and*
way, the Comforter will not come unto you ; *xiv. 6.*
but if I depart, I will send him unto you, that
he may abide with you for ever. Thus
 Christ has plainly taught us, that we may
 always expect his Presence with us, not in his
 Body, but his Spirit, the Comforter, the
 Third Person in the Sacred Trinity, who
 is One God with Him and the Father : But
 it is expedient that *He himself should go a-*
way. And sure, *Christ* is the best Interpre-
 ter of his own Promise. * Besides, the *Lu-*
therans can never prove it possible for a
 Body to be made Omnipresent, because
 Omnipresence is an incommunicable At-
 tribute of Divinity : And 'tis of the Es-
 sence of a Body to be circumscribed and
 bounded with certain Limits ; so that to
 talk of an Infinite or Omnipresent Body, is
 a Contradiction ; therefore, by this Do-
 ctrine, the Humane Nature of *Christ* is ut-
 terly destroyed and confounded with His
 Divinity ; And the Notion of the Omni-
 presence of *Christ's* Body, is so far from
 tending to support the inseparable Union
 of the two Natures, which is the Reason
Puffendorf gives for the *Lutherans* main-
 taining it so strenuously, that it rather tends
 to overthrow it, by destroying one of the
 two Natures, or at least confounding them ;
 whereas

whereas the Unity of those Natures consists not in the *Confusion of Substance*, but in the *Unity of Person*; which is such an Union, as necessarily implies, that each Nature, notwithstanding the Union, still retains its own peculiar Properties. So that, in short, this Doctrine has neither Scripture, Antiquity, nor Reason to support it, but is the pure Figment of *Luther's* own Brain; the *Reformed* have term'd it *monstrous*, as the Learned Baron informs us. I see not therefore how we can come to a Reconciliation with the *Lutherans*, except they reject this Doctrine, which is so apparently false, and contrary both to Reason and Scripture.

But though *Puffendorf* pretends, that the *Lutherans* seem to maintain the *Omnipresence of Christ's Body*, chiefly for this Reason, that they may not divide and take away the Union of the Natures, (which I have shew'd it is so far from doing, that it tends rather to destroy one of them, or at least to confound them, and thereby to overthrow that Personal Union which the Scriptures have taught, and the Church believ'd) yet it is very evident, that the Notion was invented to support another strange Doctrine never heard of in the World till *Luther's* Days; I mean, the Doctrine of *Consubstantiation*.

* For

* For so says Peter Martyr, speaking of the Omnipresence of Christ's Body, *This Doctrine* (I am persuaded) would not have appear'd good and sound to its own Authors, only they having once gone beyond the Bounds of the orthodox Faith, in affirming the real, substantial, or corporal Presence (as they grossly speak) of the Body and Blood of Christ, in the Bread and Wine of the Lord's Supper; therefore that they may some Way or other establish their Fiction, they go on to their own great Mischief, and the no small Damage of the Church, to be more confidently Mad; and for no other Reason, constantly, or rather pertinaciously maintain, that the Humanity of Christ fills all Places. These Things are more absurd, than those for whose Sake they are invented. The Papists, than whom nothing can be conceiv'd more corrupt, although they teach that vain and detestable Transubstantiation, were never so void of

* Nec ea (ut arbitror) suis Authoribus per se bel-la & sana viderentur, nisi quod semel in affirmanda reali, substantiali, corporali (ut crassa pingui-que oratione loquuntur) corporis & sanguinis Christi præsentia in pane ac vino cœ-

næ Domini fines orthodoxæ fidei transilierunt: & idcirco ut suæ figmenta quoque modo constabiliant, pergunt magno malo suo, & Ecclesiæ non levi damno, confidentius insanire; atque constanter, vel potius pertinaciter defendunt, non propter aliam causam Humanitatem Christi omnia loca implere. Absurdiora porro hæc sunt, quam ea propter quæ elaborantur. Papistæ, quibus nihil depravatus fingi potest, quamvis illam præsentiam cum vana & detestanda *persecutio* docent, non tamen adeo sunt rationis, divinarum literarum, & sensus communis expertes, ut portentosam ubiquitatem sibi unquam fabricarint, quin potius ab ea ceu dogmate prorsus diverso & alieno ab Ecclesia, vehementer abhorrent. *Pet. Mart. Dialog. de utraque in Christo Natura, fol. 1.*

Reason,

Reason, of the Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, and of Common Sense, as ever to forge for themselves this monstrous Ubiquity, but have ever heartily abhorr'd it, as a Position diverse and contrary to the Faith of the Church.

And the Lutheran does acknowledge, That this Doctrine of the Omnipresence of Christ's Body does prove, and is proved by their Doctrine of the Corporal Presence in the Holy Eucharist. For, when it was objected to him, that he had no Proof of this Omnipresence from the Scripture, and that he had no Argument for this Opinion, but the Omnipotence of God, * *We do not,* says he, *make the Body of the Lord to be every where, or in many Places, from the meer Omnipotence of God. We have the Sacred Scriptures to witness this Thing, and chiefly the Words of the Supper: For the Lord said, This is my Body.*

* Nequaquam ex nuda Omnipotentia Dei conficimus Corpus Domini esse ubi-

que, seu in multis locis. Habemus ejus rei testes divinas literas, & inter eas potissimum verba cœnæ: Dixit quippe Dominus: Hoc est corpus meum. *Ibid. Fol. 4.*

† Id sal- tem præ vobis fru-
 † Again he says, *we receive at least this Benefit more than you from our Opinion, That*
 etus & utilitatis ex nostra sententia capimus, quod firmiter credimus, nec dubitamus corpus & sanguinem Christi, verè, substantialiter ac realiter adesse in pane ac vino cœnæ, & ibi distribui ac sumi. Quod vos dicere non potestis, nec etiam profiteri, cum ipsam Christi Humanitatem doceatis & mordicus propugnetis in aliquo certo loco esse cœli, idque circumscriptiva locatione. Quare (ut vultis) cum amplius non sit in terris, non potest cum pane & vino in Cœna manducari. Non est ubique leve bonum, seu aspernandum commodum, nos de tanto Mysterio quid sentiamus posse aperte & rotunde confiteri. *Ibid. Fol. 123.* we

we firmly believe, and do not doubt, but the Body and Blood of Christ are truly, substantially, and really present in the Bread and Wine of the Supper, and is there distributed and received. Which you cannot say nor profess, since you teach, and earnestly contend, that the Humanity of Christ is in a certain Place of Heaven, and that locally circumscribed. Therefore (as you will have it) since He is no longer on Earth, He cannot be eaten with Bread and Wine in the Supper. It is not therefore a small Benefit, nor an Advantage to be despised, that we can openly and roundly confess what we believe of such a Mystery.

Here we find, that the *Lutherans* chief Argument for the Omnipresence of Christ's Body, is taken from the Words of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist, *This is my Body.* From whence they infer, that forasmuch as the Eucharist is celebrated in many Places at the same time, therefore Christ's Natural Body must be also in all those Places at least: And they think it reasonable to believe, that Christ's Humane Body is Omnipresent, that so they may confirm their Doctrine of the literal, and corporal Eating and Drinking His very true Humane Body and Blood. Now this strange Union of the literal, corporal Body and Blood of Christ with the Elements of Bread and Wine in the Holy Sacrament, is that

C

which

which is call'd *Consubstantiation*. And who sees not plainly, from these Words of *Peter Martyr's* Dialogue, that this Doctrine of the Omnipresence of *Christ*, was invented purely to support and defend that Doctrine concerning the Eucharist? For if *Christ's* Humane Body be Omnipresent, and consequently Infinite, then it follows, that it may be really, truly, and literally united to Bread and Wine consecrated in ten thousand Places at the same time: Whereas, if *Christ's* Body is circumscrib'd and limited to a certain Place in Heaven, so that it can be but at one Place at one Time, as the Church has always believ'd, then cannot the real, true, substantial, and literal Humane Body of *Christ* be given and receiv'd in the Eucharist, nor incorporated, or otherwise united to the Bread and Wine, so as to be eaten or drank with it; and consequently, without this Doctrine of the Omnipresence, the Doctrine of *Consubstantiation* falls: Who, sees not then, that this monstrous Doctrine, as *Peter Martyr* calls it, of the Omnipresence of *Christ's* Humane Body, was invented, as he says, purely to support the Doctrine of *Consubstantiation*?

But perhaps it may be said, that the *Lutheran* in *Peter Martyr* speaks only what that Reformer pleases; let us therefore hear what is said by a Divine of their own,
** Martin*

* *Martin Chemnitius* who was thirty Years * *Melch. Adam. in vit. Germ. Theol. p. 573.*
a Minister at *Brunswick*, first a Coadjutor,
and then Superintendent. This Man was
one of the first Reformers amongst the *Lu-*

therans, and wrote an *Examen* of the Council of *Trent* by Command of the Duke of *Brunswick-Lunenbourg*, and other Princes of *Germany*; I shall therefore observe what he says upon the first Canon of that Council concerning the *Eucharist*. The Canon is this.

† If any one shall deny, that in the Holy Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, the Body and Blood, together with the whole Soul and Divinity of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, and consequently whole *Christ* is truly, really, and substantially contain'd in the most Holy Sacrament of the *Eucharist*, but shall say, it is only there as in a Sign, or a Figure, or in its Vertue, let Him be Anathema.

† Si quis negaverit, in sanctissimo Eucharistia Sacramento contineri, verè, realiter & substanti-

aliter corpus & sanguinem, unà cum anima & divinitate Domini nostri *Jesu Christi*, ac proinde totum Christum: sed dixerit tantummodo esse in eo ut in signo, vel figura, aut in virtute, Anathema sit.

To this *Chemnitius* says, || There is a || De
great and sad Controversy at this Time in
the Church, concerning the Presence of the
Body and Blood of our Lord *Jesus Christ*

præsentia corporis & sanguinis Domini nostri

Jesu Christi in sacrosancta cœna, sive de vero & genuino sensu verborum cœnæ, Hoc est corpus meum, Hic est sanguis meus, vehemens & verè tristis. Hoc tempore controversia in Ecclesia: Quibusdam contententibus verba illa non esse accipienda in eo sensu, quem simplex, propria, genuina, & in Scriptura usitata ip-

forum significatio præbet ; sed per tropos eò esse detorquenda, ut vera & realis præsentia substantiæ corporis & sanguinis Christi ex cœna ipsius tollatur & submoveatur longius, quàm cœlum distat à terra. Et in cœna Dominica, apud nos in terris relinquatur tantum signum & figura procul absentis, & longè à nobis remoti corporis & sanguinis Christi : vel Christus dicatur in cœna sua præsens esse, tantum secundum divinam suam Naturam, præbens & exhibens communicantibus, non ipsam substantiam, sed virtutem tantum, & vigorem corporis & sanguinis sui, non præsentis sed procul absentis, & à cœna longius remoti, quàm aspectabile hoc cœlum distat à terra. Ego verò ab illorum opinionibus fateor me dissentire ; simpliciter verò & apertè profiteor, me amplecti & probare illarum Ecclesiarum sententiam, quæ agnoscunt ac docent veram & substantialem præsentiam corporis & sanguinis Christi in cœna, in eo sensu quem verba cœnæ, simplici, propria, usitata & genuina sua significatione præbent. Et in hac sententia, utriusque partis argumentis diligenter consideratis, acquiesco.

in His Holy Supper, or concerning the true and genuine Sense of the Words of the Supper, This is my Body, This is my Blood: Some contending those Words are not to be receiv'd in that Sense which the simple, proper, genuine, and usual Signification of them in Scripture gives us: But they are to be wrested by a Figure in such Manner, that the true and real Presence of the Substance of the Body and Blood of Christ is taken from His Supper, and remov'd farther from it than Heaven is distant from the Earth. And in the Lord's Supper nothing is left with us on Earth, but a Sign or a Figure of the Body and Blood of Christ at a great Distance, and far remov'd from us: Or Christ is said to be present in His Supper only according to His Divine

Divine Nature, yielding and exhibiting to the Communicants, not the very Substance, but the Vertue and Efficacy. of His Body and Blood; not present, but far absent, and farther distant from us than the visible Heaven is from the Earth. But, I confess, that I dissent from their Opinions, but plainly profess that I embrace and approve the Opinion of those Churches, which acknowledge and teach the true and substantial Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Supper, in that Sense which the Words of the Supper afford us in their simple, proper, usual and genuine Signification. And I acquiesce in this Opinion, after a diligent Consideration of the Arguments on both Sides.

And a little after he adds, * This Opinion offends against no Article of Faith. For it is certain, that forasmuch as in the Humane Nature of Christ dwelleth all the Fullness of the Godhead bodily, and by the Ascension, the Humane Nature in Christ is exalted above every Name that is named, either in this World, or that which is to come; therefore Christ can be where He will in His Body, and do what He will. Therefore the

* Hæc sententia in nullum fidei articulum impingit. Certum enim est, quia in humana Natura Christi, tota plenitudo

divinitatis habitat corporaliter; Et per Ascensionem humana Natura in Christo exaltata est super omne Nomen, quod nominatur, sive in hoc, sive in futuro sæculo: ideo Christum corpore suo posse ubicunque voluerit, & facere quodcunque voluerit. Præsentia igitur corporis Christi in cœna, non pugnat cum articulis fidei, vel de veritate humanæ Naturæ, vel de ascensione Christi.

Presence of Christ's Body in the Supper, is not repugnant to the Articles of Faith, or the Verity of the Humane Nature, or of the Ascension of Christ.

Is it not evident from hence, that the *Lutherans* make use of the Omnipresence of *Christ's* Humane Nature, to prove the Corporal Presence in the Holy Eucharist. We all readily agree with them, that *Christ's* Body is exalted as far as Humane Nature is capable of Exaltation, and far beyond our weak Conceptions: That *Christ* can be where he will in his Body, and do what he will. But we cannot believe that he can be bodily present in Heaven and Earth, and in all Places where the *Eucharist* is administered, at the same time. This Notion is therefore plainly invented, as *Peter Martyr* has observed, to prove, if possible, the Corporal Presence of *Christ* in the *Eucharist*, according to the *Lutheran* Notions; and is put upon us by this Superintendent of *Brunswick*, as an Article of Faith.

Therefore, as the Learned Baron maintains the Omnipresence of *Christ's* natural
 * P. 208. Body, * so he also defends the Doctrine of the Corporal Presence of *Christ* in the *Eucharist*, and says, *The Lutherans determine that the Bread and Wine remain what they are, as well in the Use of them as afterwards; and yet, so that in the Use of the Sacrament, the Body and Blood of Christ are verily*

rily present, together with the Elements, and are indeed taken and received with the Mouth of the Body, but, in a Manner, that cannot be perceived by the Senses: And so, indeed, that there is not any new and peculiar Body produced for every Communicant, and given to him, but so that all the Communicants do truly partake of that one Body of Christ which hung upon the Cross, and of that Blood which he there shed. It is true, both he and Chemnitius do say, That they do not establish this Opinion on the Omnipresence of Christ. Neither does Peter Martyr charge them to have established it on that Foundation; but only that having established this Opinion, they have recourse to the Omnipresence of Christ for the Proof of it, and maintain that Ubiquity of Christ's Body, because they conceive it a good Argument to convince their Followers, that they do actually receive the very real substantial Body of their Saviour. For if the Body of Christ can be in many Places at once, no Doubt is to be made, but that it is in the Holy Eucharist.

And now let us see, how this Consubstantiation differs from Transubstantiation. The Papists say, that in the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is truly, really, and substantially the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is a Change

made of the whole Substance of Bread into the Body, and of the whole Substance of Wine into the Blood, which Change they call Transubstantiation. The Lutherans say, that the Bread and Wine remain what they were, but the Body and Blood of Christ are present together with the Elements, and are indeed taken and receiv'd with the Mouth of the Body. This is what is call'd Consubstantiation. So that both agree, that in the Eucharist we eat and drink the real, substantial Body and Blood of Christ, which was broken and shed on the Cross; only the Papists say, we eat and drink them in the Elements, which are substantially converted into them; and the Lutherans say, we eat and drink them with the Elements. But both maintain, that we eat and drink the very Body and Blood of Christ which hung upon the Cross, and that we eat it with our Mouths, which is Blasphemy.

* Art. 28. Whereas our Church teacheth, * that the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an Heavenly and Spiritual Manner. And the Mean whereby the Body of Christ is receiv'd and eaten in the Supper, is Faith. So that the Lutherans are, in this Case, as far from the Doctrine of our Church as the Papists. And when either Papists or Lutherans are press'd with Arguments drawn from the Senses

Senses against their Doctrine, they have recourse to God's Omnipotence. The *Papists* say, according to the.* *Trent Cate- * De Eu-*
chism, *that whatsoever the Lord pleaseth, char. 8.*
that He doth both in Heaven and Earth. 32.

And the Learned Baron says, in behalf of the *Lutherans*, that to those Reasonings which are objected from the Judgment of the Senses, and the Nature of natural Bodies, the Truth and Omnipotence of God is justly oppos'd, by which this may easily be perform'd. Now he that can believe what is contrary to the Judgment of his Senses, and the Nature of Things, and supposes that God's Omnipotence can reconcile Contradictions, as the Learned Baron owns the *Lutherans* do in this Case, may easily believe *Transubstantiation*. And the same Arguments we make use of to refute the *Papists* on this Occasion, may serve to refute the *Lutherans*.

Another Doctrine, which *Puffendorf* discourses of, wherein the *Lutherans* differ from the *Calvinists*, is the Doctrine of Grace and Predestination; but I do not find that the *Lutherans* differ from the Church of *England* in this Point, and shall therefore make no Reflexion on any Thing he has said on this Subject.

As to other Matters, wherein the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* differ, *Puffendorf* does
but

* P. 237. but just mention them, because * he says, *they are all of them such as do not touch the Foundation of the Faith, and so are wont to go under the Name of indifferent Things.* But whether all Persons will be of the Baron's Opinion in this Matter, is much to be question'd. I am sure, our Zealots here have cry'd out upon some of the most innocent of them, as most wicked and abominable; I shall therefore content myself to name them as he has done, without any Reflexions.

The Reform'd, says he, object against the Lutherans some Relicks of the Popish Rites not sufficiently purg'd away. Into the Number of which, they put the Exorcism retain'd in Baptism, the private Confession, and what is wont to accompany it, the sacred Penny, the round Wafers us'd in the Lord's Supper, which hardly retain the Nature of Bread; Altars also and Candles, and many Images retain'd in their Churches, and among others, that of our Saviour hanging on the Cross, the particular Garments of Ministers, the Bending the Knee, and Uncovering the Head at the Mention of the Name of Jesus; the superfluous Festival Days, the exorbitant Use of Musick, and other Things of the like Nature. Those who have been so very severe upon the Church of England for symbolizing with the Church of Rome in a few of the most unexceptionable

able of these Ceremonies, and who once threw down her Altars, and turn'd her Churches into Stables, because they had been polluted with such superstitious Rites; who persecuted, plunder'd, and barbarously treated all her Bishops, and such Presbyters as adher'd to them, and have since revil'd them as *Baal's* Priests, on Account of a few of these Ceremonies; may perhaps be inclin'd to judge hardly of the *Lutherans*, who have still retain'd so many more of these Rites. But I desire them to consider, that notwithstanding this Multitude of Ceremonies, the *Lutherans* are as great Enemies to the *Pope*, and the Church of *Rome*, as ~~They~~ can be; and though they have retain'd so many *Popish* Rites, are nevertheless strict and rigid *Presbyterians*, and have as little Agreement with the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of *England*, as the most zealous *Calvinists*. However, we of the Church of *England* may hope and pray, and use all lawful Endeavours, by fair Means and Persuasions, to draw Dissenters of all Sorts into the Communion of the Establish'd Church, by setting before them the Error of their Ways. And it is to be hop'd, that the *Lutherans* in particular, having before their Eyes the great Example of our now Sovereign, will, as I doubt not but he has done, judge it best, as well for their Spiritual

ritual as Temporal Interest, to join heartily in Communion with the Establish'd Church of *England*, which is reform'd nearest to the Primitive Pattern of any Church this Day in the *Christian* World, and has ever been found the strongest Bulwark against Popery: And to attempt any farther Reformation of it, either in Favour of *Calvinists*, or *Lutherans*, will be but to make it less Primitive and Apostolical.

I have one Thing more to add before I conclude my Letter, which is, that the Learned Baron himself does not think a Reconcilement can be effected otherwise
 * P. 364. than by Time: * *It seems to me* (says he, at the Conclusion of his Book) *that this Dissention cannot be taken away at once, or in the Twinkling of an Eye, but the Remedy must be expected from Time: The Process of which may produce much for the Reconciling both Sides: And the Truth, is the Method of Reconcilement propos'd by him, is calculated to be the Work of Time; for though he pretends to talk of Arguments, and forming Systems of Divinity wherein all may agree, yet, when he comes to propose his System, he forms it altogether on the Lutheran Principles, and his Essay for Union is in Effect only design'd to persuade the Calvinists to become Lutherans. And indeed, as Mr. Hales observ'd long ago,*
 an

an Union cannot be effected by other Means. * For, as he says, in his Letter from the Synod of Dort, dated January 4. 1619. ^{* Hales's Remains, P. 446.} In the Point of the Sacrament, and the Dependencies from it, as the Ubiquity of Christ's Manhood, the Person of Christ, the Communicatio idiomatum, &c. either they must yield to us, or we to them; neither of which is probable. Their Opinions have now obtain'd for an hundred Years (and 'tis now near an hundred more since Mr. Hales wrote this Letter, so that these Opinions must at this Time be more firmly fix'd amongst them) ever since the beginning of the Reformation, and are deriv'd from the chief Author of the Reformation. It is not likely therefore, that they will easily fall, that have such Authority to support them. But I suppose, adds he, Monsieur Du Moulin [who was the Person propos'd the Union Mr. Hales speaks of] intended only a mutual Toleration; and be it no more, yet if we consider the Indisposition of the Persons with whom we have to deal, I take this likewise to be impossible. The Lutherans are divided into two Sorts; either they are Molliores, as we call them, or Rigidi. What Hope there may be of Moderation in the first, I know not; but in the second we may well despair of it. For they so bear themselves,

setves, as that it is evident they will rather agree with the Church of Rome, than with the Calvinist. He that is conversant in the Writings of Hunnius and Grawerus, will quickly think as I do. The first of which has so bitterly written against Calvin, that Parsons the Jesuite furnish'd himself by compiling Hunnius his Book. If the whole Lump be leavened, as those two Pieces, which I just now named, they are certainly too sower for moderate Men to deal with. This was Mr. Hales's Opinion of an Union between the Lutherans and Calvinists a hundred Years ago; he then conceived it to be impracticable, and says they were more ready to join with the Papists than the Calvinists. And how far such an Union may be more practicable now, has been already consider'd; and it may be yet a Question, which the Lutherans would rather choose to unite with, the Papist or the Calvinist. For though Baron Puffendorf seems to be himself rather enclined to unite with the Calvinists, having, as * he says, received good Offices of many of that Religion; yet † he informs us, that a most Serene Prince and Lord, gave a special Command to two of his Divines, to write a Method to restore an Ecclesiastical Union between the Romanists and the Protestants. So that whatsoever

* P. 196. having, as * he says, received good Offi-

† P. 44. ces of many of that Religion; yet † he informs us, that a most Serene Prince and Lord, gave a special Command to two of his Divines, to write a Method to restore an Ecclesiastical Union between the Romanists and the Protestants. So that whatsoever

ever Baron *Puffendorf*'s own private Opinion was as to the Impracticableness of such an Union ; it is plain, that Serene Prince and his Divines did not conceive it altogether impossible ; if they had, they would not have fram'd a Scheme for it. But the Baron having some private and particular Obligation to some *Calvinist* Princes, thought it more proper to propose an Union with them : But I do not find, that his Scheme was drawn up by the Command of any Prince, or with the Approbation of any Divines of that Communion. And after all, the Union he designs, seems to be no more than to persuade the *Calvinists* to embrace, or at least to entertain a favourable Opinion of the *Lutheran Principles*.

But though the *Lutherans* are such Enemies to the *Calvinists*, amongst which, as appears from *Puffendorf*, they number the *English* ; yet it is to be hop'd, that when they come to be better acquainted with our Church, and find that they have been misinform'd concerning her ; and that she was not reform'd upon the *Zuinglian* or *Calvinist* Principles, but upon the truly Catholick and Apostolick Principles of the Primitive Church ; I say it is to be hop'd, that they will easily be persuaded to follow the great Example of our Gracious Sovereign

A Review of the, &c.

Sovereign King GEORGE, and most heartily embrace her Communion: Which that they and all other Dissenters from us, whether Natives or Foreigners, may do, is the hearty Prayer of

S I R,

Spring - Grove,
Sept. 27. 1714.

Your most

Humble Servant,

THO. BRET.



P O S T

POSTSCRIPT.

S I R,



AD I not resolv'd to confine myself to the Principles contain'd in Baron *Puffendorf's* Book, I could have mention'd some other Points wherein the *Lutherans* differ from the Church of *England*.

For whereas the Church of *England* declares thus in her sixth Article, *All the Books of the New Testament, as they are commonly receiv'd, we do receive and account them Canonical*; the *Lutherans*, as * Father * *Hist. Concil. Trident. Lib. II. Sess. 3.* *Paul* observes; have cast out as Apocryphal these that follow, 1. The Epistle to the *Hebrews*. 2. The Epistle of *St. James*. 3. The second Epistle of *St. Peter*. 4. The second, 5. And the third Epistles of *St. John*. 6. The Epistle of *St. Jude*. 7. The Revelation of *St. John*. || And *Chemnitius* the Superintendent of *Brunswick* gives his Reasons (such as they are) why these Books ought not to be receiv'd into the Canon of Scripture. *Chemnit. Examen Concil. Trident. Part I.*

Also whereas the Church of *England*, in her Office of *Private Baptism*, has given

D

Directions

Directions concerning the Receiving those into the Church, who have receiv'd such Baptism; amongst which, this is one, If they which bring the Infant to the Church do make such uncertain Answers to the Priest's Questions, as that it cannot appear that the Child was baptiz'd with Water, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost (which are essential Parts of Baptism) then let the Priest baptize it in the Form before appointed for Publick Baptism of Infants; saving that at the Dipping of the Child in the Font, he shall use this Form of Words. If thou art not already baptiz'd, *N. I.*

*Gerhard.
Confess.
Cathol.
Par. II.
p. 942.

baptize thee, &c. * The Lutherans say, it is an absurd and erroneous Opinion to teach, that Baptism is to be repeated absolutely or conditionally, if it have been given in the Name of Christ only, or of one Person in the Trinity, without any Mention of the other two. So that to hold it necessary to baptize in the Name of all the three Persons in the Trinity, which is expressly declar'd by the Church of England, agreeable to the Sense of the whole Catholick Church, and to the express Command of Christ Himself, to be Essential to Baptism, is held by the Lutherans to be an absurd and erroneous Opinion. I could produce other material Points, besides those mention'd by Baron Puffendorf, wherein the Lutherans differ from us; but I at present content

tent myself with these two, to convince you that the Learned Baron has, by no means, given an Account of all the Differences between us even in weighty Matters.

I shall add but one Thing more by way of Caution, which is, that you would be particularly careful of being imposed upon by the Words *Protestant Religion*: An Expression which has of late been very frequent in the Mouths of a certain Party. For if we confine that Name to any one *Sect*, as the word *Religion* in the Singular Number seems to do, then, in its proper genuine Sense, it signifies the *Lutheran Religion*, because the *Lutherans* were the first who publicly, in a particular solemn Manner, entred their *Protest* against the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*, * which they did * *Osiand. Cent. 16.* in the geneal Dyet of the Empire at *Spire*, *cap. 9. P. 130, 131.* in *Germany*, in the Year 1529. by which they obtained the Name of *Protestants*, being so called from that particular solemn Protestation, made before all the Estates of the Empire, in such a manner as was never done by any other Church or *Sect*. But if we take the word *Protestant* in another Sense, and as it is commonly understood to denote any Church, *Sect*, or Person, who openly *Protests* against the Corruptions of the Church of *Rome*, then we cannot say the *Protestant Religion* in the Singular Number, but must say *Protestant Religions* in the Plural

Plural Number: For, in this Sense, the word *Protestant* is only Negative, and does not denote of what Religion the Church, Sect, or Party so called are, but only what they are not, viz. They are not *Papists*. And in this Sense, not only the *Lutherans* and the *Calvinists*, but the *Anabaptists*, *Quakers*, *Muggletonians*, *Socinians*, *Deists*, nay, and *Atheists*, all may, and do come under the Denomination of *Protestants*, as well as the *Church of England*. So that to say the *Protestant Religion*, in this Sense, is nothing but Cant and Jargon, without any distinct proper Meaning. And to say the *Protestant Religion* in a restrained Sense, to denote any one Sect of *Christians* who may be called by that Name in a supereminent Manner, as the first and most solemn *Protesters* against *Popery*, to whom the Name was given, on Account of that particular *Protestation*, signifies no other than the *Lutheran Religion*. This I thought convenient to observe to you, that you may take heed, lest you be imposed on by a Name.

